

12-16-2002

U.S. Patent & TMOfc/TM Mail Rcpt Dt. #73

# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TI BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EDUCATIONAL MEDIA FOUNDATION,

Opposer,

v.

.

OPPOSITION NO. 122,045

HISPANIC BROADCASTING CORPORATION,

Applicant.

# APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION OF CIVIL COMPLAINT SUPPORTING ITS UNOPPOSED TO MOTION TO SUSPEND PROCEEDINGS

Pursuant to the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board's Order dated December 4, 2002, Applicant HISPANIC BROADCASTING CORPORATION ("Applicant" or "HBC") hereby submits the attached copy of the original complaint filed in the civil action instituted on September 12, 2002 in the United Stated District Court for the Central District of California under CA No-02-7134 (AJWX). A copy of the complaint was inadvertently omitted from Applicant's Consented Motion to Suspend Proceedings filed, on September 23, 2002. Applicant regrets any inconvenience this may have caused.

Date: December 11, 2002

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory W. Carr Theodore F. Shiells George M. Tompkins

CARR LAW FIRM, L.L.P.

670 Founders Square 900 Jackson Street Dallas, Texas 75202

Telephone No. (214) 760-3000 Facsimile No. (214) 760-3003

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT HISPANIC BROADCASTING CORPORATION

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

> Karen L. Feisthamel KENYON & KENYON 1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700 Washington, D.C. 20005

ATTORNEYS FOR OPPOSER EDUCATIONAL MEDIA FOUNDATION

```
TISDALE & NICHOLSON, LLP
    Guy C. Nicholson (SBN 106133)
    Michael D. Stein(SBN 132540)
    2029 Century Park East, Suite 900
    Los Angeles, CA 90067
 3
    Tel: (310) 286-1260
    Fax: (310) 286-2351
 5
    CARR LAW FIRM, LLP
    Gregory W. Carr
    Theodore F. Shiells
    George M. Tompkins
 7
    670 Founders Square
    900 Jackson Street
 8
    Dallas, TX
    Tel: (214) 760-3000
 9
    Fax: (214) 760-3003
10
    Attorneys for Plaintiffs
    Hispanic Broadcasting Corporation
`11
    HBC Los Angeles, Inc.; HBC San Diego, Inc.
    and HBC Broadcasting Texas, L.P.
12
13
                         UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14
                        CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
15
16
    HISPANIC BROADCASTING
17
                                                                    (AJWY
    CORPORATION, a Delaware
    corporation; HBC LOS ANGELES,
18
                                      COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND
    INC., a California
19
                                      INJUNCTIVE RELIEF ARISING FROM
    corporation; HBC SAN DIEGO,
                                      TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT, TRADEMARK
    INC., a Delaware corporation;
                                      DILUTION, AND UNFAIR COMPETITION
    and HBC BROADCASTING TEXAS,
    L.P., a Texas Limited
21
    Partnership
                                      DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
22
               Plaintiffs,
23
          vs.
24
    EDUCATION MEDIA FOUNDATION, a
25
    California corporation,
26
               Defendant.
27
28
```

G:\WORLDOX\CLIENTS\0843\001\CB5410.DOC

COMPLAINT FOR DAMANGES AND

Plaintiffs HISPANIC BROADCASTING CORPORATION; HBC LOS
ANGELES, INC., HBC SAN DIEGO, INC., and HBC BROADCASTING TEXAS,
L.P. (collectively "Plaintiffs") bring this action against
defendant EDUCATIONAL MEDIA FOUNDATION ("Defendant"), alleging
causes of action for trademark infringement, trademark dilution
and unfair competition, as follows:

## **PARTIES**

- 1. Plaintiff HISPANIC BROADCASTING CORPORATION is a Delaware corporation having its principal place of business located at 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue, Suite 215, Dallas, TX 75219.
- Plaintiff HBC LOS ANGELES, INC., is a California corporation having its principal place of business located at 655
   N. Central Ave., Suite 2500, Glendale, California 91203.
- 3. Plaintiff HBC San Diego, Inc., is a Delaware corporation having its principal place of business located at 600 W. Broadway, Suite 2150, San Diego, California 92101.
- 4. Plaintiff HBC Broadcasting Texas, L.P., is a Texas
  Limited Partnership having its principal place of business located
  at 1415 N. Loop West, #550, Houston, Texas 77008.
- 5. On information and belief, Defendant Educational Media Foundation is a California corporation doing business within this judicial district and elsewhere.

## JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This action arises under, inter alia, the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. sections 1051, et seq. The Court has jurisdiction of this action pursuant to 15 U.S.C. section 1121 and 28 U.S.C. sections

1331, 1332 and 1338. The Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims alleged herein pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1367.

U.S.C. section 1391(b)(2), which provides that a civil action may be brought in any judicial district where a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred. In addition, venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 1391(b)(1), which provides that venue is appropriate in any district in which a defendant resides, and 28 U.S.C. section 1391(c), which provides that a defendant that is a corporation shall be deemed to reside in any judicial district within which the corporate defendant has sufficient contacts to subject it to personal jurisdiction if that district were a separate state.

.11

#### NATURE OF THIS ACTION

8. Plaintiff HISPANIC BROADCASTING CORPORATION ("HBC"), itself and through one or more licensees, is engaged in the business of providing, inter alia, entertainment, advertising, broadcasting, and related services via telecommunications channels, including radio and the Internet, as well as via a variety of other mediums (collectively, the "Broadcasting Services"). HBC is also engaged in the business of providing, itself or through one or more of its licensees, a variety of goods promoting the Broadcasting Services, including, inter alia, backpacks, sports bags, tote bags, baseball caps, sweatshirts, T-shirts, Frisbees, coffee mugs, and mouse pads (collectively, the "Broadcasting Goods").

- 9. Plaintiff HBC is the owner of the trademark and service mark K-LOVE, which is used in connection with the Broadcasting Goods and Services. Plaintiff HBC, itself and its predecessors and licensees, have collectively used the K-LOVE service mark continuously from at least as early as October 1974 to the present.
- 10. Plaintiff HBC is the owner of federal service mark application Serial Number 75/430,440 for K-LOVE, which was filed February 6, 1998, and California state service mark Registration No. 27817 for K-LOVE, which issued August 13, 1986.
- 11. Plaintiff HBC Los Angeles, Inc. and its predecessors have been at all relevant times the owners and operators of, inter alia, radio station KLVE-FM, which is located in and operates from the Los Angeles, California metropolitan area.
- 12. Plaintiff HBC Los Angeles, Inc., is licensed to use the K-LOVE mark, with the consent and under the control of Plaintiff HBC, to identify and distinguish the Broadcasting Goods and Services of radio station KLVE-FM.
- 13. Plaintiff HBC San Diego, Inc., is the owner and operator of, inter alia, radio station KLQV-FM, which is located in and operates from the San Diego, California metropolitan area.
- 14. Plaintiff HBC San Diego, Inc., is licensed to use the K-LOVE mark, with the consent and under the control of Plaintiff HBC, to identify and distinguish the Broadcasting Goods and Services of radio station KLQV-FM.
- 15. Plaintiff HBC Broadcasting Texas, L.P., is the owner and operator of, inter alia, radio station KOVE-FM, which is located in and operates from the Houston, Texas metropolitan area.

.11

- 16. Plaintiff HBC Broadcasting Texas, L.P., is licensed to use the K-LOVE mark, with the consent and under the control of Plaintiff HBC, to identify and distinguish the Broadcasting Goods and Services of radio station KOVE-FM. Additionally, Plaintiff HBC Broadcasting Texas, L.P., formerly used the K-LOVE mark, with the consent and under the control of Plaintiff HBC, to identify and distinguish the Broadcasting Goods and Services of radio stations KOVA-FM and KLTO-FM.
- 17. Plaintiffs and, on information and belief, Plaintiffs' predecessors in interest, have expended, and Plaintiffs continue to expend, substantial efforts and sums advertising and promoting their Broadcasting Goods and Services offered in connection with the K-LOVE mark.
- 18. Plaintiff HBC, through its own efforts, skill and experience, and that of its licensees, has acquired and now enjoys substantial goodwill and a valuable reputation under its K-LOVE mark, which serves to distinguish Plaintiffs' services from the services of others. Plaintiff HBC's K-LOVE mark has become well known and famous, both within the trade and among the relevant consuming public.
- 19. On information and belief, Defendant Educational Media Foundation is engaged in the business of providing one or more of the Broadcasting Goods and Services via at least radio and the Internet.
- 20. On information and belief, Defendant is advertising and soliciting business and listeners for its broadcasting services in the same channels of trade that Plaintiffs use in marketing their Broadcasting Goods and Services offered in connection with the K-

28 Se

LOVE mark, and Defendant is offering its Broadcasting Goods and Services to the same class of purchasers as Plaintiffs offer their Broadcasting Goods and Services.

- 21. Defendant has adopted and used, and continues to use, without Plaintiff HBC's permission, the designation K-LOVE to identify and denote Defendant's Broadcasting Goods and Services.
- 22. Defendant first adopted the infringing designation K-LOVE and commenced use of said designation long after the adoption and first use of the K-LOVE mark by Plaintiff HBC, and long after the issue date of Plaintiff HBC's California state registration of the K-LOVE mark.
- 23. On August 23, 2002, counsel for Plaintiffs sent a cease and desist letter to Defendant, putting Defendant on notice of Plaintiffs' rights in the K-LOVE mark and of Defendant's infringement of Plaintiffs' rights. Nonetheless, Defendant continues to use the infringing designation K-LOVE in connection with its Broadcasting Goods and Services.

#### FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

[Violation of Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 1125(a)]

- 24. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 23, as though fully set forth herein.
- 25. Defendant's use of the designation K-LOVE, as alleged hereinabove, so resembles the distinctive K-LOVE mark of Plaintiffs used in connection with the same Broadcasting Goods and Services, and offered in the same channels of trade and to the

.11

mistake, and/or to deceive, members of the relevant consuming public and the trade, in violation of Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. 1125(a), as to: (1) the source or origin of Defendant's radio broadcasting services, (2) the existence of an affiliation, connection, or association between Plaintiffs and Defendant, where none exists, and (3) sponsorship or approval by Plaintiffs of Defendant and its broadcasting services, where none exists.

- 26. The acts of Defendant tend to dilute and reduce the value of Plaintiffs' goodwill under the K-LOVE mark, and to destroy the exclusive association between Plaintiffs and the K-LOVE mark.
- 27. The acts of Defendant constitute the use of a false description and representation of Defendant's broadcasting and related services, which services Defendant has advertised, offered and sold in interstate commerce in violation of §43(a) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a).
- 28. As a direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendant in violation of section 43(a) of the Lanham Act, as alleged herein, Plaintiffs have suffered and continue to suffer damages in an amount not yet fully ascertained.
- 29. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law and have suffered and continue to suffer, irreparable harm as a result of Defendant's wrongful acts.
- 30. On information and belief, Defendant will continue the wrongful conduct complained of herein and, unless enjoined, will continue such conduct, to Plaintiffs' irreparable damage.

#### SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

# [Common Law Trademark Infringement]

- 31. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 30, as though fully set forth herein.
- 32. Defendant has been and is using in commerce a reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of Plaintiff HBC's K-LOVE mark in connection with the sale, offer for sale, and advertising of the Broadcasting Goods and Services, which dilutes and reduces the value of Plaintiffs' goodwill and tends to destroy the exclusive association between Plaintiffs and the K-LOVE mark.
- 33. The acts of Defendant are likely to deceive and cause confusion of the public and in the trade, and to induce the public and the trade to believe that Defendant or its businesses are in some manner related to, approved by, or sponsored by Plaintiffs, and such acts constitute infringement of Plaintiff HBC's common law trademark rights in its K-LOVE mark.

 $\sqrt{11}$ 

## THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

#### [Common Law Unfair Competition]

- 34. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 33, as though fully set forth herein.
- 35. The acts of Defendant constitute unfair competition, palming off, unjust enrichment, and misappropriation of Plaintiffs' rights in that such acts permit, and will continue to permit, Defendant to use and benefit from the goodwill and reputation earned by Plaintiffs to obtain a ready customer and trade acceptance for its broadcasting services offered under the

1	K-LOVE designation on the basis of a reputation not established in
2	Defendant's own right, and to give Defendant's services and
3	products a salability they otherwise would not have, all at the
4	expense of Plaintiffs.
5	36. The continuing sale of broadcasting services by
6	Defendant under the K-LOVE designation will continue to constitute
7	acts of unfair competition, palming off, unjust enrichment, and
8	misappropriation by Defendants against Plaintiffs, unless enjoined
1	1

.11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

by this Court.

## FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

[Trademark Dilution, 15 U.S.C. section 1125(c)]

- 37. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 36, as though fully set forth herein.
- 38. Plaintiff HBC's K-LOVE mark is distinctive and famous, within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. section 1125(c).
- 39. Defendant's use of the infringing designation K-LOVE, as alleged above, wrongfully dilutes the distinctive quality of Plaintiff HBC's K-LOVE mark in violation of 15 U S.C. section 1125(c).
- 40. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, as alleged herein, Plaintiffs have suffered, and continue to suffer, damages in an amount not yet fully ascertained.

24

25 | / / /

26 | //

27 ||//

#### FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

[State Law Trademark Infringement, California Business and Professions Code section 14335]

- 41. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 40, as though fully set forth herein.
- 42. Defendant's use of the infringing designation K-LOVE, as alleged above, infringes Plaintiff HBC's registered service mark, as evidenced by California Registration No. 27,817, in violation of section 14335 of the California Business and Professions Code.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

[State Law Trademark Dilution, California Business and Professions Code section 14330]

- 43. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 43, as though fully set forth herein.
- 44. Defendant's use of the designation K-LOVE, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful trademark dilution of Plaintiff HBC's registered service mark, as evidenced by Registration No. 27,817, and Plaintiffs' common law rights in such mark, in violation of section 14330 of the California Business and Professions Code.

## SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

[State Law Trademark Counterfeiting, California Business and Professions Code section 14320]

- 45. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 44, as though fully set forth herein.
- 46. Defendant's use of the designation K-LOVE, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful trademark counterfeiting of Plaintiff

1 | HBC's registered service mark, as evidenced by Registration No. 27,817, in violation of section 14320 of the California Business and Professions Code. In addition to any other allowable remedies at law or equity, Plaintiffs are entitled to the remedies specified in section 14340 of the California Business and Professions Code.

7

8

9

10

411

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

3

5

6

#### EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

[Unfair Competition in Violation of California Business and Professions Code sections 17000, et seq.]

- Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 44, as though fully set forth herein.
- The aforementioned acts of Defendant constitutes unlawful, unfair, fraudulent and misleading business practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code section 17200.
- Plaintiffs are thus entitled under California Business and Professions Code section 17203 to injunctive relief and restitutionary relief in the form of disgorgement of Defendant's profits derived from its wrongful acts as alleged herein.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

21

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment in their favor as follows:

That the Court award Plaintiffs their damages Α. proximately caused by the wrongful acts of Defendant, as alleged above, in a sum not yet ascertained;

-11

- B. That Defendant be required to account for and pay to Plaintiffs all gains, profits, benefits, and advantages derived by Defendant from its wrongful acts as alleged above;
- C. That Plaintiffs recover from Defendant their attorneys' fees incurred as a result of Defendant's wrongful acts, as alleged above, including, without limitation, such fees incurred in connection with the instant action, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. section 1117;
- D. That Plaintiffs recover from Defendant their costs of suit incurred in this action;
- E. That all damages awarded to Plaintiffs be trebled pursuant to 15 U.S.C. section 1117(a) and Section 14320 of the California Business and Professions Code;
- F. That the Court order Defendant and each of its officers, agents, servants, employees, directors, attorneys, representatives, and related companies and all persons in active concert or participation with any of them, be permanently enjoined from:
  - (1) using in any manner the designation K-LOVE or any colorable imitation or other confusingly similar designation;
  - (2) otherwise infringing upon any trade name or service mark rights of Plaintiffs;
  - (3) otherwise unfairly competing with Plaintiffs, and from committing any other acts which discourage or destroy the public's recognition of Plaintiff HBC's K-LOVE mark as a service mark for Plaintiffs' Broadcasting Goods and Services; and

- (4) passing off, or inducing or enabling others to sell or pass off, services or products not Plaintiffs' as and for services or products of Plaintiffs;
- G. That Defendant be ordered to deliver up to the court for destruction, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. section 1118, any and all tangible matter within its possession, custody or control bearing the infringing designation K-LOVE or any confusingly similar designation;
- H. That Defendants be directed to file with this Court, within thirty (30) days after the entry of any injunction in this cause, a written statement under oath setting forth in detail the manner in which they have complied with that injunction; and
- I. That Plaintiffs have such other relief as this Court may deem appropriate.

Dated: September 12, 2002

TISDALE & NICHOLSON, LLP Guy C. Nicholson Michael D. Stein

-and-

Gregory W. Carr Theodore F. Shiells George M. Tompkins CARR LAW FIRM, L.L.P

By:

Guy C. Nicholson

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
Hispanic Broadcasting Corporation,
HBC Los Angeles, Inc., HBC San Diego,
Inc., and HBC Broadcasting Texas,
L.P.

#### DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 38-1, Plaintiffs hereby demand a trial by jury on all issues triable as of right by jury.

Dated: September 12, 2002

TISDALE & NICHOLSON, LLP Guy C. Nicholson Michael D. Stein

-and-

Gregory W. Carr Theodore F. Shiells George M. Tompkins CARR LAW FIRM, L.L.

By:

Guy C. Nicholson
Attorneys for Plaintiffs
Hispanic Broadcasting Corporation,
HBC Los Angeles, Inc., HBC San Diego,
Inc., and HBC Broadcasting Texas,

L.P.